

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

The Examiner objected to the information disclosure statement filed on July 21, 2006, based on 1.98(a)(2), because it did not include legible copies of each cited foreign patent document. Applicant is submitting a new IDS containing the Japanese language references as cited in the original IDS. Applicant requests confirmation that the references have been considered.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a), as the drawings fail to show the “[C]amera support section configured so that it can be installed on an upper side and a lower side of the camera” from claim 3. Applicant has amended claim 3 to obviate the objection. The camera support section can be installed on both the upper and lower sides, but not necessarily at the same time. Applicant requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. As stated above, claim 3 has been amended to obviate the rejection.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 because it is not clear whether the camera installation base or the camera support section is on a coupling reference surface. Applicant clarifies that the coupling reference surface is an imaginary plane and not a physical surface. Applicant directs the Examiner’s attention to paragraph 0053 of the published application (U.S. No. 2008/0226282), stating. “The coupling reference surface Y is a plane extending in parallel with a mating surface of the coupling

member 30.” See also Figs. 1, 3, 6A and 6B. Therefore, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bernhardt (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,222), hereinafter “Bernhardt”. Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations from the specification, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Support for the amendments in claim 1 can be found in paragraphs 0023-0025, 0031, 0032 and 0044 of the published application. Applicant respectfully asserts that Bernhardt fails to disclose that “the camera installation member and the camera support section are coupled by a coupling section having a fitting structure” and “the coupling angle of the camera support section with respect to the camera installation base is defined as an angle on a coupling reference surface which intersects with the coupling direction, and the coupling angle of the camera support section with respect to the camera installation base is varied by changing an installation angle of the coupling section with the fitting structure between the camera support section and the camera installation base.” Furthermore, Bernhardt fails to disclose any reference to a coupling angle and a coupling reference surface wherein that angle is varied by changing an installation angle of the camera support section as defined in claim 1. Bernhardt merely discloses that when the camera is mounted to a wall, the pivot axes A1-A4 can be adjusted to obtain a satisfactory image. See Col. 10, line 60 to Col. 11, line 24 and Fig. 22. Accordingly, Bernhardt fails to anticipate all the limitations in amended claim 1.

As Bernhardt fails to teach every limitation of claim 1, claim 1 and the respective dependent claims 2-4 are not fully anticipated by the cited reference. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bernhardt. Claim 2 depends directly on claim 1, thus are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bernhardt in view of Elberbaum (U.S. 5,240,220), hereinafter “Elberbaum”. As claim 3 depends from claim 1, Bernhardt does not disclose that “the camera installation member and the camera support section are coupled by a coupling section having a fitting structure” and “the coupling angle of the camera support section with respect to the camera installation base is defined as an angle on a coupling reference surface which intersects with the coupling direction, and the coupling angle of the camera support section with respect to the camera installation base is varied by changing an installation angle of the coupling section with the fitting structure between the camera support section and the camera installation base.” Further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching that the above limitations are disclosed in Elberbaum. Therefore, even if Bernhardt were combined with Elberbaum, the combination of Bernhardt and Elberbaum fail to teach or otherwise render obvious or predictable every limitation of claim 1. Thus, claim 3 is patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 40869.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /michaelwgarvey/

Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: January 21, 2009